EXTRA — North Vietnam's Terms for Peace, P. 2

For Once We Agree Whole-Heartedly With Barry Goldwater

"If Republican spokesmen in the last Presidential campaign had proposed the use of non-lethal gas in Vietnam, . . . they would have been depicted as dangerous, hip-shooting, irresponsible warmongers. . . . Any proposal for dealing firmly with the Communists is regarded by some commentators as warmongering if it comes from Republicans, but something entirely different if it is carried out by the Democrats."

—Barry Goldwater in the New York Herald-Tribune April 3.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 14 APRIL 12, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Peace Feelers? Is the Truth About Them Being Withheld?

At a press conference April 1, President Johnson gave a curious answer when asked if he had "any evidence of a willingness on the part of the Communists to negotiate" in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson replied that he had "no evidence that they are ready and willing to negotiate *under conditions that would be productive.*" (Our italics.) It is a pity there was no opportunity to obtain a clearer answer. That day the London *Times* published a letter from a Laborite member of Parliament, Wm. Warbey (see Page 2), outlining North Vietnam's offer of a peace settlement as explained to him in Hanoi when he spoke with Ho Chi Minh and Premier Pham Van Dong there ten weeks ago. "They had previously said it to others," he wrote, *"who passed the message on to Washington."* Perhaps this explains why Mr. Johnson, instead of denying that there had been any peace feelers, said there had been none he would consider "productive."

Far from Candid

This is not the only indication that the Administration is being less than candid. In a debate on the Vietnamese war in the British House of Commons April 1, a Laborite called attention to a statement by the Foreign Minister of Cambodia which said Ho Chi Minh had responded favorably to the recent initiative of the non-aligned countries for a reconvening of the Geneva conference. The Foreign Secretary in his reply said cryptically, "There are now signs that give more grounds for hope than even a day ago." (*The Times,* London, April 2). The following day however Secretary Rusk in an interview with BBC did his best to discourage hopes of negotiation. He said that in other conflicts such as over Berlin, Korea and Laos there had been "some private contact" which indicated that "a satisfactory basis of settlement" could be found. "That is missing here," Mr. Rusk said. He was then asked by the BBC man, "You've had silence completely?" The answer was, "No indication that—despite a number of contacts of various sorts—no indication that Hanoi is prepared to leave Laos and South Vietnam alone." This indicates that far from a complete "silence" there had been "a number of contacts of various sorts" but none which satisfied the Secretary that Hanoi was prepared to "leave South Vietnam alone." His definition of this seems to be that Hanoi call off the rebellion in the South. What did Hanoi offer?

Some indication is provided by a *New York Times* dispatch from Moscow April 1 which quoted non-aligned diplomats in that capital as saying that Hanoi privately was not insisting on the withdrawal of U.S. forces as a precondition for talks. This supports Mr. Warbey's letter which has not been fully reported in this country. The terms, as the reader will see, call for neutralization of the North as well as the South and allow South Vietnam to determine its own destiny by democratic means under international guarantees. Such terms can be considered "unproductive" only by those who want to maintain a satellite military dictatorship in South Vietnam.

All this is highly relevant to two new proposals put forward in the Senate during the past few days: One by Javits of New York that no combat troops be sent in without first obtaining the approval of Congress by specific resolution; the other by McGovern of South Dakota that Mr. Johnson call off the bombing attacks and set up an advisory council of "experienced statesmen" like Senators Mansfield, Russell, Aiken, Fulbright and Cooper "who have no personal stake in trying to force the success of our presently hopeless policy." Mr. Johnson's main advisers, McNamara, Rusk, McCone, Gen. Taylor and McGeorge Bundy, are men whose advice during the past four years on Vietnam has been consistently and disastrously wrong. In any normal job they would have been fired for it long ago. They ought not to be allowed to compound past errors with new and more dangerous adventures until the possibilities for peace have been fully disclosed and explored.

Lying-As-Usual

"In contrast to the generally gloomy conclusions drawn by Senators and Representatives from Ambassador Taylor's testimony on Capitol Hill, the Ambassador presented an optimistic picture at the unusual press conference called by the President in the Cabinet Room after the National Security Council meeting. He said he was 'very much encouraged' by the new government of Premier Phan Huy Quat. . . ."

—New York Times, April 3.

"Saigon, March 20—The U.S. faces imminent defeat in South Vietnam. The defeat ahead is a military one. The cliche of this war is that the problem is more political than military, but the military situation has been deteriorating so fast that political efforts have all but collapsed."

—Richard Dudman in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch March 20 beginning a six-part series on the war after a six week tour of South Vietnam.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Both North and South To Be Neutralized—Separate Rule for South in Federal Union

British Labor MP, Recently Returned from North Vietnam, on Its Peace Terms

By Wm. Warbey, MP *

Amid daily reports of new horrors in the war against the Vietnamese people, one ray of light breaks through from the Washington horizon. President Johnson says that he is ready to negotiate a peace settlement, on the basis of "a return to the essentials of the 1954 Geneva agreement." This is precisely what President Ho Chi Minh and Prime Minister Pham Van Dong said to me ten weeks ago in Hanoi—as they previously said it to others who passed their message on to Washington. Moreover, they spelt out clearly what they meant:

The South Would Govern Itself

1. International recognition of the independence and unity of Vietnam as one country and one people. 2. International recognition of the existence, during a transitional phase, of two separate and equal political administrations in Hanoi and Saigon. 3. The right of the people of the Northern zone to live in peace under a government whose authority they have visibly accepted for 11 years. 4. The right of the people of the Southern zone to form and support a government which genuinely represents all the major sections of the Southern population. 5. The right of the whole of Vietnam to enjoy freedom from any kind of foreign intervention in its internal affairs. 6. The right of the people of Vietnam to solve through free and equal negotiations between the two administrations the problems of the reunion of divided families, of the reopening of trade, communications between North and South, of free access to homes and lands, and of eventual political reunification under a possibly federal government. 7. The right of each of the two political administrations to enjoy economic, cultural and "fraternal" relations with countries of its choice. 8. The reaffirmation of the military neutrality clauses of the Geneva Agreement, providing that there shall be no foreign bases and no imported foreign arms, except as replacements, and that no part of Vietnam shall enter into a military alliance with any foreign power, except in self-defense if attacked by a foreign power.

In addition, Mr. Pham Van Dong told me emphatically that this time his government will insist that these rights and conditions shall be embodied in an international treaty binding on all the participants. I challenge any impartial person to find anything unreasonable in these proposals. They are known to be acceptable to France, Cambodia, the Soviet Union and China. They must be acceptable to Britain. Now it appears they are acceptable to President Johnson as well.

What, then, holds up a peace conference, and the ending of the slaughter? North Vietnamese insistence on a withdrawal of American forces as a precondition? No. Mr. Pham Van Dong was emphatic that this was not a pre-condition. . . . The only precondition is the Americans and the South Vietnamese Air Force must stop their attacks on North Vietnam. Here is a dilemma, because the Americans make the same demand the other way around. The only way out is surely a simultaneous cease-fire by all the four parties to the conflict: the South Vietnam People's Liberation Army; the Army and Air Force of the Saigon Government; the Americans; the North Vietnamese Government. The ICC [International Control Commission] members—India, Canada, Poland—could arrange this all-around cease-fire and supervise it. And all the parties, including the Great Powers and the warring parties within Vietnam could come simultaneously to the Conference table at Geneva, Warsaw, Paris or Rangoon, at the invitation of—say—Britain, France, the Soviet Union and Cambodia. Why not?

* British Labor MP, in a letter, London Times, April 1.

Clear and Unmistakable Evidence: Vietcong Weapons of Red Origin — Red American Indian, That Is

El Paso, Tex. (UPI)—Capt. Francisco I. Pena, an Army physician, may be the first soldier since Gen. Custer to get the Purple Heart for an arrow wound. Capt. Pena, originally from McAllen, Texas, was shot with a crossbow in Vietnam. . . . Two months after Capt. Pena was wounded, a lieutenant in another outfit got the same kind of wound. "I wanted to see him and sympathize," Capt. Pena said. "I had been kidded so much about my wound that I knew what he was in for."

—New York Times, April 3.

Opening the ADA Convention With a Speech That Might Have Been Given at Pentagon

"Ever since the pace of the hostilities in Vietnam accelerated, and particularly since the Administration's decision to bomb North Vietnam, there has been a certain element of hysteria in liberal circles. . . . What particularly disturbs me is the growth of part-time pacifism, or liberal isolationism. . . . I recall distinguished liberal and socialist spokesmen informing us that Hitler was just a rational spokesman for German national interest. . . .

"This examination of U.S. options in Asia will begin with an analysis of the character of the main enemy—Red China . . . the Red Chinese have been at war with us since 1950. . . . Our power is being dissipated in a Balkan war. . . . We are in the right war, but in the wrong place The future of Asia cannot be determined in Indochina. . . . If a full war broke out, Vietnam . . . would be a net liability. . . .

"The Johnson Administration's tactics . . . has been ferociously attacked as immoral, vicious and provocative at innumerable political prayer meetings in recent weeks. . . . There is nothing more immoral about bombing staging areas in North Vietnam than there is in North Vietnamese support for Vietcong terrorists in the South. . . . Yet I am opposed to it because even if (as I expect would be the case) no general war occurs. . . . Hanoi can drag us from a marginal intervention (27,000 troops) into a full scale Balkan war without overt Chinese assistance. . . . Consequently we should not raise the ante with Hanoi, but should intensify our commitment in the South to the level where only conventional techniques (not guerrilla tactics) could seriously hurt us . . . and plan to hold on indefinitely."

—John P. Roche of Brandeis, retiring chairman of the ADA at the opening of its 18th annual convention in Washington, D.C. April 2. The convention, after heated debate, adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire and neutralization of Indochina. A sentence saying, "ADA believes the Administration's aims are not different from its own" was struck out of the draft as originally prepared.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powell Warns War On Poverty, Too, Requires New Non-Racist Officials in South

If We Void Elections for Reapportionment, Why Not for Civil Rights?

The civil rights groups that know the South best because they are working in its small towns and rural areas have been warning Congress of the need to provide far more protection for the Negroes whom the Administration's voting rights bill will register. Their main proposal would require new elections within six to nine months after a county receives its federal registrar. "How effective will this bill be in Neshoba County, Mississippi," a representative of the Freedom Democratic Party asked rhetorically at a House Judiciary hearing, "if local law enforcement remains in the hands of Sheriff Rainey and Deputy Sheriff Price for four more years?"

No Elections Until 1968

The same question might be asked of all the Black Belt counties throughout Alabama, Louisiana and Georgia. In none of these will there be new elections until 1968, and Mississippi's municipal officers will not come up for re-election again until 1969. "Passage of this voting rights bill without requiring new elections," the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee warned in its testimony, "will lead directly to a degree of terror and intimidation yet unseen in the civil rights movement." "This bill in effect leaves violence and intimidation as the only out for those who would prevent Negro voting," SNCC said, pointing to the Ku Klux Klan's reign of terror when Congress first gave Negroes the right to vote after the Civil War.

This is the most serious problem that the present voting bill fails to face. Its only remedy makes intimidation of Negro voters a federal crime punishable by a $5,000 fine or five year's imprisonment or both. Although this is an advance over the civil penalties of previous bills, it still relies upon the dubious premise of conviction by Southern juries. New elections would circumvent this problem, and both the legal precedent and constitutional authority for requiring them are unambiguously clear. In the reapportionment cases, federal courts in New York, Connecticut and Virginia are shortening existing legislative terms by requiring new elections wherever the value of votes in different districts has been diluted by gerrymandering or population shifts. Should not this same remedy apply where there has been disenfranchisement on the basis of race or color? The reapportionment cases, it is true, have been based on court action under the 14th Amendment. But the 15th Amendment, which is the basis for the voting rights bill, clearly empowers Congress, as distinguished from the federal courts, to remedy denial of the right to vote because of race or color.

There is a second compelling reason for new elections. In testimony before House Judiciary, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, whose Labor Committee is in charge of the Poverty Program legislation, said that in the South today "the War on Poverty is completely stymied by these local officials. The War on Poverty is for white people only." SNCC's testimony offered these statistics: It said that in Mississippi, "the poorest state whose Negro population is the poorest of the poor," only one-quarter of the State's 82 counties allow surplus government food to be distributed to the population at anytime of the year. Discrimination in the use of local school funds, according to the State's own figures for 1960, "reached a point of more than $100 being spent for each white child to $1 for each Negro child." This is the terrible cost of delaying local elections in the South. Under pressure from the civil rights movement, Congress is now tightening the Administration's bill and extending its geographic coverage. But only a provision for voiding racially rigged elections can thwart the ingenuity of the white supremacists.

Critics Barred?

There was some evidence that the White House wanted its Conference on International Cooperation, scheduled for next winter, to prepare the way for a major breakthrough in the cold war. The same private interests that underwrote the recent Pacem in Terris meeting have agreed to finance the preliminary committee work. When the President announced the Conference last month, he spoke of it as leading to "new and thoughtful evaluations" of what we can do in international relations. But at the first committee meetings, March 23, Leo Goodman, an AFL-CIO expert on atomic energy and a frequent critic of the AEC, was barred from attending the session on atomic energy. The AEC, Goodman later learned, was disturbed that his appointment had not been cleared first with the Commission! If this is the way government agencies are stacking the Conference, it will be suspect from the start.

When It Comes to The Klan, HUAC's Chairman Sounds Like Mr. Justice Holmes

It's hard to teach an old dog new tricks. The Chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, in announcing that it had voted unanimously to investigate the Klan, said this would not be enough to reestablish "peace and order." "There are other racial agitators at work in all parts of the country," Chairman Willis (D. La.) said, "Communist influence is at work in this field." HUAC's conditioned reflexes always lead it back in the same direction.

On April 3, to his credit, Attorney General Katzenbach suddenly called a press conference intended to head off a Red hunt into the civil rights movement. He said it was not true at all that Communists had obtained control or influence over any of the civil rights organizations or their leadership. But that won't keep the un-Americans from finding their favorite plot.

Though Mr. Willis, in his prepared statement called "Klanism incompatible with Americanism," he sounded like a charter member of the American Civil Liberties Union on Face the Nation April 4, in discussing his forthcoming investigation of the Klan. "We are embarking in sensitive areas. . . . First we have to dig hard for facts, facts, facts. . . . By activities I mean just that. I don't mean thoughts, beliefs or anything of the sort." HUAC members don't usually sound off like Oliver Wendell Holmes.

We don't understand this talk of legislation to deal with the Klan. Where it commits crimes, there is no dearth of criminal laws to deal with them. The difficulty is in getting convictions because white juries in the South consider terror against Negroes and civil rights workers more or less meritorious action. The roots of the problem lie in this atmosphere. For this purpose a Presidential Commission to investigate patterns of violence, as proposed by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in a telegram to the President opposing an inquiry by HUAC, makes sense.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saskatchewan Doctors, Who Once Struck Against It, Find Social Medicine Profitable

Some Dangerous Concessions to the AMA in the New Health Care Bill

Rep. Wilbur Mills (*D., Ark.*) and his Ways and Means Committee have produced a health care bill for the aged that is a compromise with the AMA. From the standpoint of benefits, the bill offers an enlarged version of the liberals' own proposals. It contains the Administration's plan for hospital care under Social Security plus a new voluntary insurance program. In the latter, the government will pay out of general revenue half the cost of all doctor services. The other half of the cost will be covered by $3 monthly contributions from the aged. This neatly turns the tables on the AMA, which campaigned against medicare on the ground that it failed to cover doctor bills. But this progress is balanced off with an AMA-type plan of administration that fails to provide effective control over the quality and spiraling cost of medical care.

Regulation By Self-Audit

The private health insurance carriers have been virtually ineffective in this area. Commercial carriers are timorous because they depend on doctors' good will for new customers. Blue Shield is run almost solely by doctors, and public representation on Blue Cross boards is outnumbered two-to-one. Yet the health care bill places in the hands of these private carriers full responsibility for auditing the charges of the doctors and hospitals under the voluntary insurance program. This is little better than a self-audit.

The voluntary insurance program will be difficult to dismantle once it gets started. Vested medical interests will see it as a subsidy and will try to channel future extensions of federal health insurance into it rather than into the Social Security System, where the danger of bankrupting the entire System would force the government to pay close attention to medical costs.

A second major concession to the AMA is the treatment of medical specialists at work in hospitals. The hospitals prefer to pay these specialists a salary rather than permit them a fee-for-service for each patient. The reason is that the specialists, particularly pathologists and radiologists, evaluate the performance of surgeons and other doctors who practice at the hospital. Without an independent salary, the specialists would become dependent for their livelihood upon referrals from the doctors whom they supervise. The health care bill weakens this form of quality control by refusing to reimburse hospitals for the services of its medical specialists; it forces the specialists to charge a separate fee to each aged patient. For 30 years the AMA has unsuccessfully been fighting this system of quality control. What it has been unable to do, Congress is about to do for it.

It is time for liberals in Congress to face this issue of the quality and especially the cost of medical care. If the government is footing the bill, it should pay the salary too. The recent experience in Canada with socialized medicine is instructive. In Saskatchewan, in 1962, doctors went on a 23-day strike to protest a total health care plan. Today, according to the *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 15), the plan has brought a 10% increase in the number of doctors practicing in the province, and doctors' earnings have climbed "due to an increased volume of service and negligible collection problems." If the AMA were really interested in the welfare of its members, it would be telling them about this new way of practicing medicine in Canada.

Just A Cigar Makers' Plot

"You know tobacco is a real big money industry, one of the biggest in the United States. I remember immediately after the Surgeon General's report, a friend of mine asking what effect I thought it would have. I said, 'If I was in the investment business, if I had money to invest, I would go buy cigar stock.' I got the paper this morning. I won't name the company, but a prominent cigar manufacturing company, the stock at that time was on the market. Shortly after I checked it at $27. Today it is listed at $40- plus. I wonder if perhaps some of the real influence behind the business of cigarettes and leaving cigars alone and pipes alone, I wonder if maybe some of it is being inspired by some people who are interested in selling more cigars."

—Sen. Ross Bass (D., Tenn.), *at Sen. Commerce Committee hearings on Cigarette Advertising, Mar. 30.*

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/12/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED